

Pinellas County Schools

Shore Acres Elementary School



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Shore Acres Elementary School

1800 62ND AVE NE, St Petersburg, FL 33702

<http://www.shoreacres-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Benigna Polla UF A

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2018-19 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	52%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: A
School Grades History	2017-18: C 2016-17: B 2015-16: B 2014-15: B 2013-14: B
2018-19 Differentiated Accountability (DA) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Tracy Webley
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N
Year	A
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

To provide a rigorous educational program to prepare students to be life-long learners and productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement

Succeed Achieve Educate
100% Student Success

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title
Sulte, Kristen	Principal
Principal	
Massey, Chelsea	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Holman, Stacy	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Johnson, Laura	Other
Other	
Barnard, Stacey	Instructional Media
Instructional Media	
Waechter, Kristin	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Quinn, Julia	Teacher, ESE
Teacher, ESE	
Doscher, Tamara	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Gajentan, Laura	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Luckey, Shannon	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Garris, Heather	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	69	86	117	101	92	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	564
Attendance below 90 percent	2	14	12	11	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	9	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	15	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	5	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

36

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/16/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	19	21	19	20	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	9	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	16	17	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	10	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	62%	54%	57%	54%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	59%	58%	43%	47%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	54%	53%	29%	40%	48%
Math Achievement	68%	61%	63%	61%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	75%	61%	62%	62%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	48%	51%	39%	42%	47%
Science Achievement	54%	53%	53%	58%	57%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	69 (0)	86 (0)	117 (0)	101 (0)	92 (0)	99 (0)	564 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	2 ()	14 ()	12 ()	11 ()	12 ()	9 ()	60 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	9 (0)	1 (0)	5 (0)	15 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	15 (0)	20 (0)	36 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	63%	56%	7%	58%	5%
	2018	58%	53%	5%	57%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	56%	4%	58%	2%
	2018	51%	51%	0%	56%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	53%	54%	-1%	56%	-3%
	2018	46%	50%	-4%	55%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	62%	62%	0%	62%	0%
	2018	63%	62%	1%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	70%	64%	6%	64%	6%
	2018	62%	62%	0%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	64%	60%	4%	60%	4%
	2018	54%	61%	-7%	61%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	51%	54%	-3%	53%	-2%
	2018	57%	57%	0%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	50	64	50	55	75	60	47				
ELL	20	64		27	50						
BLK	46	46		41	59	44	36				
HSP	39	59		54	56						
MUL	83			67							
WHT	66	58	56	74	82	65	58				
FRL	49	55	60	54	64	50	40				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	36	24	6	34	40	41	39				
ELL	11	38		33	67						
ASN	70			70							
BLK	36	34	13	39	39	14	25				
HSP	44	37		42	54	45	73				
MUL	63	50		75	67						
WHT	59	45	31	70	70	50	61				
FRL	42	36	27	50	54	35	49				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	488
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	57
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	75
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	66
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends

Our students with disabilities and African American Students showed lowest performance in ELA. Contributing factors include: Students new to Shore Acres, grouping of ESE students, push in versus pull out for interventions and lack of culturally relevant reading material for these groups of students.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline

Our African American students in the Lowest 25% percent had the greatest decline. Contributing factors include: Students new to Shore Acres, grouping of ESE students, push in versus pull out for interventions and lack of culturally relevant reading material for these groups of students.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends

Our Students with Disabilities have the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Our students are not meeting expectations or showing learning gains. The contributing factors include: push in versus pull out for interventions, lack of progress monitoring and replacement of interventions based on that data and grouping of students.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The learning gains of our lowest 25% on both ELA and Math showed most improvement. A focused effort on data analysis and action planning contributed to the improvement.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Our Early Warning Systems data showed that we are not making gains with Attendance of those students missing 10% or more of school.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year

1. African American Gap
2. Students with Disabilities Gap
3. Attendance
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 62% of all students at proficiency on ELA FSA. The problem/gap is occurring because lack of teacher understanding of prior and next grade level expectations. If cross grade articulation would occur, students meeting proficiency would increase by 8% to 70%. If teachers regularly assess student and utilize data to organize student to interact with content in manners which differentiate/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student, students making a learning gain would increase 6% to 64%.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 62% to 70%, as measured by FSA. The percent of students making a learning gain on ELA will increase from 59% to 65%, as measured by FSA. The percent of students in the lowest 25% making a gain on ELA will increase from 57% to 63%, as measured by FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kristen Sulte (sultek@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Empower ELA champions /cohort teachers to develop as literacy leaders through facilitating peer observations, feedback and coaching colleagues in literacy practices. Regularly assess(formally and informally) and analyze data in PLCs to inform instruction in whole group, small group as well as one to one instruction. Utilize data with students to set goals.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Through the problem solving process we determined that a deeper understanding of other grade level standards and expectations was needed to accomplish our goals. District support includes development of administrators and ELA Champions. These individuals would work together to ensure professional development and articulation occurs at each grade level. It was also decided that regularly assessing would lead to better aligned lessons, focused interventions and goal setting with students.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use data to intentionally plan instruction aligned with a high level of rigor by using Marzano's Taxonomy and and adjust instruction to ensure differentiation, interventions and enrichment while scaffolding learning to increase student performance. 2. Development of PD calendar to include: Cross Grade Articulation dates, Peer Observations and PD given to ELA Champion for whole school dissemination. 3. Weekly PLCs with a focus on analysis of student data. 4. Weekly Collaborative Planning utilizing data and District ELA Modules 5. While students are practicing, teachers observe, take notes and confer with students in individual or small groups to probe for understanding and provide targeted, actionable feedback. 6. Utilize student MAP data to determine current levels of performance and set goals for mid and end of year. Align enrichment and remediation opportunities based on student data.

7. Administrators walkthroughs will give feedback on differentiation, responsive teaching and target task alignment.

**Person
Responsible**

Kristen Sulte (sultek@pcsb.org)

#2	
Title	Math
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 68% of all students at proficiency on Math FSA. The problem/gap is occurring because lack of teacher understanding of prior and next grade level expectations. If cross grade articulation would occur, students meeting proficiency would increase by 6% to 74%. If teachers regularly assess student and utilize data to organize student to interact with content in manners which differentiate/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student students making a learning gain would increase 5% to 80%.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students achieving Math proficiency will increase from 68% to 74%, as measured by FSA. The percent of students making a learning gain in Math will increase from 75% to 80%, as measured by FSA. The percent of students in the lowest 25% making a gain in Math will increase from 57% to 62%, as measured by FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kristin Waechter (waechterk@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each students. Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from Standards in alignment with district resources.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Through the problem solving process we determined that a deeper understanding of other grade level standards and expectations was needed to accomplish our goals. District support includes Unit Planning Protocol, Dreambox and Professional Development for all staff on new Math adoption. Regular PD through PLC and staff meetings to include data analysis would also lead to increased student achievement.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All teachers will attend Summer Math adoption professional development. 2. Development of PD calendar to include: Dreambox Learning PD first and second semester, Number Routines, Unit Planning Protocol and new Math adoption. 3. All staff will utilize Math Unit Planning Protocol during weekly Collaborative Planning 4. Weekly PLCs with a focus on analysis of lesson quizzes or the digital comprehension checks. 5. Use data(formal and informal) to intentionally plan instruction aligned with a high level of rigor by using Marzano's Taxonomy and and adjust instruction to ensure differentiation, interventions and enrichment while scaffolding learning to increase student performance. 6. Utilize student MAP data to determine current levels of performance and set goals for mid and end of year. Align enrichment and remediation opportunities based on student data
Person Responsible	Kristin Waechter (waechterk@pcsb.org)

#3	
Title	Science
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 54% of all students at proficiency in Science. The problem/gap is occurring because standards-based instructional planning and data analysis to differentiate and scaffold instruction is not currently meeting the needs of each student.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students achieving Science proficiency will increase from 54% to 62%, as measured by SSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kristin Waechter (waechterk@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Utilize diagnostic data to identify instructional resources to support the on-going review and expansion of learning with an emphasis on information text and academic vocabulary. Utilize systemic documents to effectively plan for science units that incorporate the 10-70-20 science instructional model and includes appropriate grade-level utilization of science labs in alignment with the Standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers use of data to plan for instruction in the lower grades and as a review for those in 5th is needed to increase student achievement. A better understanding and implementation of the 10-70-20 science instructional model through collaborative planning is also needed to attain our goal.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Analysis and Utilization of 5th grade Diagnostic data with teachers in grades 3-5 to plan instruction and review plan for 5th graders. Fourth and Fifth grade students will utilize the unit assessments. Low performing standards will be identified and embedded into review plan. 2. Weekly Collaborative Planning using Science SLAG and Instructional model. 3. Development of PD calendar to include: Instructional Delivery Model- 10-70-20 4. Monitor for consistent effective instruction that promotes student centered rigor for all science labs in grades 1-5. 5. Weekly PLC to analyze unit data and plan for embedded review plan. 6. Implement and monitor science academic gaming based on data, with a priority focus on the 60 Power Words and other related vocabulary based on grade level standards.
Person Responsible	Kristin Waechter (waechterk@pcsb.org)

#4	
Title	Bridging the Gap- Black Student Achievement- ESSA Subgroup - Both ELA and Math
Rationale	Currently 46 % of our Black students meet proficiency in ELA and 41% on Math. While the subgroup meets ESSA requirements there is a gap. There is 20% gap in ELA with White students and 15% gap on Math. The problem/gap is occurring because current instructional practices are not meeting the needs of culturally diverse students.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of Black Students meeting expectations in ELA and Math will increase to 56% as measured by FSA. 100% of students will make a learning gain.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kristen Sulte (sultek@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Provide targeted professional development and coaching to teachers and leaders on culturally relevant strategies to increase engagement of Black Students. Implementation of culturally relevant instructional practices in the classroom. Utilize students data to ensure that students needing remediation in ELA and Math are provided opportunities for reteaching and practice.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	A focused year long PD on culturally relevant teaching strategies during PLC, Staff meetings and Collaborative planning will help close the achievement gap that now exists. The use of multiple forms of student data (formal and informal) to inform instruction will increase students achievement and provide for focused remediation.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development of PD calendar to include: Equity and Excellence training, culturally relevant teaching strategies and MAP data analysis 2. Utilize student MAP data to determine current levels of performance and set goals for mid and end of year. Align enrichment and remediation opportunities based on student data. 3. Weekly Collaborative Planning utilization of Culturally Relevant teaching strategies. 4. Identify students with EWS data and provide mentors or check in and check out 5. Weekly PLCs with a focus on analysis of student data. 6. Monitor the implementation of culturally relevant teaching strategies during walkthroughs with feedback to teams and teachers
Person Responsible	Kristen Sulte (sultek@pcsb.org)

#5	
Title	School Climate/Conditions for Learning
Rationale	Overall student referral data has declined over a three year period. The risk ratio for Black students is currently 53%. Our expected level should be 27%.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The risk ratio of black students receiving an office referral will be 27% as measured by referral data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kristin Waechter (waechterk@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Strengthen the ability of all staff to establish and maintain positive relationships with all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	During the problem solving process it was determined that cultural and socio-economic bias from staff exists. The use of Early Warning Systems data isn't fully utilized or/and interventions put in place for identified students.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Update school wide behavior plan focusing on PBIS, Restorative Practices and development of correction menu. 2. Collect multiple sources of data: behavior calls, behavior incidents and referrals and analyze and develop action plans based on data. 3. Develop PD calendar to include: Equity and Excellence, Restorative Practice including proactive and restorative circles and Social Emotional Learning 4. Daily class circles 5. Use of PLC for data analysis and action planning
Person Responsible	Kristin Waechter (waechterk@pcsb.org)

#6	
Title	Student Attendance
Rationale	Currently 16% of students miss 10% or more of school. The problem/gap exists because there is not a strong Tier One plan in place to positively impact school attendance. If a strong Tier One plan existed to include problem solving the problem would be reduced by 6% to 10%. Our currently daily attendance rate is 95%and we want to increase it to 97%.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percentage of students missing 10% or more of school will be 10% as measured by attendance data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Melanie Every (everyme@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Strengthen the attendance problem-solving process to address and support the needs of students across all Tiers on an on-going basis.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Through the problem solving process it was determined that a comprehensive attendance plan addressing all tiers was not in place. The level of students absences has remained consistent at 16% for the past three years.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CST to develop Attendance Plan to address all Tiers, incentives and accurate attendance procedures 2. Develop PD calendar to include: Training on Attendance Plan 3. Develop Family Engagement Team to address parent and students engagement with the school. 4. Review attendance data twice a month for effectiveness of strategies and implementation of Tier 2 and 3 plans.
Person Responsible	Melanie Every (everyme@pcsb.org)

#7	
Title	Family and Community Engagement
Rationale	Shore Acres has a visible and strong Parent Teacher Association who works in collaboration with staff to build positive family and community relationships through engagement efforts. There is no formal way to collect data and survey parents to determine effectiveness of strategies. If parents were surveyed and data used, a more comprehensive and focused engagement plan would be created based on parent responses.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Families at Shore Acres will participate in a minimum of 3 engagement activities as measured by sign in and/or survey data. The end of the year self assessment data will show 25% improvement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kristen Sulte (sultek@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Development on Family Engagement Plan based on parent survey data will focus engagement efforts.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	A Comprehensive Family Engagement Plan based on data that includes opportunities to advocate at school and home will led to positive and increased family engagement.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop Family Engagement Team and Plan to include: addressing survey data, communication and relationship building 2. Survey Parents 3. Work with PTA to plan family activities with focus on academics in 50% of the activities. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Kristen Sulte (sultek@pcsb.org)

#8	
Title	Healthy Schools
Rationale	Our current level of performance is Silver Level Recognition with the Alliance for a Healthier Generation. We expect to maintain our Silver designation by increasing the overall health and well being among students and staff.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our school will be eligible in 6 out of 6 modules for silver recognition by April 2020 as evidenced by Alliance for a Healthier Generation's Healthy Schools Program.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Heather Garris (garrish@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Enhance staff capacity to support students through purposeful activation and transfer strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If our Healthy School Team can monitor the implementation of administrative guidelines for wellness, our school will have greater opportunity to remain eligible for recognition. Healthy students will perform better in school.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assemble Healthy School Team to include: PE teacher, Classroom teacher, Wellness Champion, Administrator, Cafeteria Manager, Parent and student 2. Attend district supported professional development 3. Complete Healthy Schools Program Assessment 4. Complete the SMART Snacks in School Documentation 5. Develop and implement Healthy School Program Action Plan 6. Apply for Recognition
Person Responsible	Heather Garris (garrish@pcsb.org)

#9

Title Student with Disabilities - ESSA Subgroup in both ELA and Math
 Currently 50 % of our Students with Disabilities meet proficiency in ELA and 55% on Math. While the subgroup meets ESSA requirements there is a gap.
Rationale There is a 16% gap in ELA with White students and 19%% gap on Math. The problem/gap exists because current instructional practices are not meeting the needs of our students.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve
 The percentage of ESE Students meeting expectations in ELA will increase to 68% as measured by FSA and FSAA.
 The percentage of ESE Students meeting expectations in Math will increase to 74% as measured by FSA and FSAA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome
 Kristen Sulte (sultek@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy
 Students requiring ESE services work toward mastery of meaningful Individualized Education Plan (IEP) goals while learning the foundational skills they need to engage in rigorous, grade-level content in the Least Restrictive Environment. Utilize progress monitoring data and engaging in analysis to match intervention to goals and data. Ensure instructional supports are in place for our ESE students during core instruction and independence.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy
 The use of data as well intervention delivery method will lead to high academic gains of our ESE students. ESE teachers collaborating with teachers during ELA and Math planning will lead to alignment and rigor.

Action Step

Description
 1. Determine class placement of ESE students based on current levels of performance
 2. Determine intervention delivery model
 3. For grade levels with push in ESE teacher will meet weekly during collaborative planning - grades 3, 4 or 5 as determined by students data
 4. ESE interventions will be aligned to standards and to the rigor as needed
 5. ESE teachers will determine current levels of performance using MAP data and set mid and end of year goals with students
Person Responsible Kristen Sulte (sultek@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

optional

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: ELA				\$1,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	2110	140-Substitute Teachers	4021 - Shore Acres Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$1,000.00
			<i>Notes: Substitutes for Planning, fishbowl lessons and work with coach</i>			
	3373	500-Materials and Supplies	4021 - Shore Acres Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$500.00
			<i>Notes: Materials for Reading tool kits</i>			
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: Math				\$3,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	2110	140-Substitute Teachers	4021 - Shore Acres Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$3,000.00
			<i>Notes: Funds for TDE to Collaborate on planning , lessons, fishbowl and work with coaches. Purchase Common Core Companion for all teachers. Purchase Ms. Math Academic Number Sense games for classrooms with PD</i>			
3	III.A	Areas of Focus: Science				\$0.00
4	III.A	Areas of Focus: Bridging the Gap- Black Student Achievement- ESSA Subgroup - Both ELA and Math				\$3,750.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		500-Materials and Supplies	4021 - Shore Acres Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$3,750.00
			<i>Notes: Intervention Materials</i>			
5	III.A	Areas of Focus: School Climate/Conditions for Learning				\$0.00
6	III.A	Areas of Focus: Student Attendance				\$250.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		590-Other Materials and Supplies	4021 - Shore Acres Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$250.00
			<i>Notes: Attendance Incentives</i>			
7	III.A	Areas of Focus: Family and Community Engagement				\$0.00
8	III.A	Areas of Focus: Healthy Schools				\$0.00
9	III.A	Areas of Focus: Student with Disabilities - ESSA Subgroup in both ELA and Math				\$0.00
					Total:	\$8,500.00